



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ibášu, (21) ḥarânam namrašam, (22) uruḥ zumami (23) irtidi—as an example of a wider use; but ašar in this case may be regarded as having its primary meaning, with the relative understood before it, and used just as it is in Lotz, *Tiglathpileser*, p. 28, l. 38. The fact that kibsi ends in *i*, though not demonstrative evidence of it, has its bearing in this direction; for the termination *i* is very rarely found in the nominative of nouns.¹ The similarity between ašar and אֲשַׁר may be explained, then, as a mere coincidence.

The further objections of Hommel, namely, that *l* and *r* in Semitic are never exchanged for each other, and that *r* is never found as a pronominal stem—if true, are not vital to the essence of Sperling's claim. It would seem, however, that אֲשַׁר might be more naturally derived from the shorter relative than is attempted by him. Hommel is right in maintaining that שׁ is original, and שׂ derived; but having שׂ, the transition to שׁ is not difficult, whether we suppose the Dāghēš to have arisen simply to make prominent the previous sound (as Sperling claims), or as compensation for the ל of שׁל; for the use of ר to avoid Dāghēš-forte is not unknown in Semitic, but is found, not only in Aramaic and Hebrew Quadriliterals, but also in other words, as, e. g., כְּרִסָּא for כְּסָא, דְּרִמְשֶׁק, beside דְּמִשֶׁק. After the addition of ר, the word might easily take on the character of a separable, and then prosthetic א would be appropriate. Cf. the Samaritan d e, but with suffixes e d. For the change of an inseparable into a separable cf. בָּמוֹ, לָמוֹ.

According to this explanation, then, the original שׂ was supported by Dāghēš-forte and deflected to שׂ. For the Dāghēš, ר was afterwards substituted, and the word thereby formed received prosthetic א, an increase familiar in the Semitic tongues.

C. R. BROWN,

Newton Centre, Mass.

Genesis xx., 16.—It is shown by Dillmann, in his *Kommentar*, that וְנִכְחַת is found in the Nīph'al Perf. 2d sing. f., with wāw consecutive, and his translation may be rendered into English as follows: *And with all (that are with thee)—thus thou art proved one to whom a wrong has been done or thus thou art justified.* וְ is consecutive, and introduces the conclusion from the preceding statement. A Participle is out of place in such a connection, and a feminine noun no less so. We might suppose the word to be Perf. 3d fem. in תָּ, and concerning the whole matter thus it is settled; but this idea would be expressed with the masculine, not the feminine. Hence our author feels himself shut up to the second person fem., and he corrects the text to וְנִכְחַת. So far Dillmann. In the occurrence of such a form, however, is there not a key to the solution of the problem of the helping — of Lāmēdh Guttural verbs in the 2d person feminine? Some writers regard it as *furtive*, while others regard it as a full vowel; but this reading (if correct) in תָּ seems to be nearly decisive for the second hypothesis, for it gives us a form which is just what we should expect the verb to assume under the influence of a helping vowel, and similar to יִרְבֵּ, זֶרַע, מִקֶּךָ. In such cases as these, a final aspirate, if preceded by the helping vowel, loses its hard sound, though it is quite

¹ Cf. C. H. Toy, in *American Journal of Philology*, Vol. V., No. 4.

usual to retain the hard sound and go without the helping vowel, and we have such forms as **וַיִּשֶׁת** and even a noun **נִרְדָּה**. It is a singular fact, however, that, in very rare instances, the hard sound is retained after the helping vowel has been inserted, e. g. in **יַחַד**, Job III., 6; **יִרְדֶּה**, Ps. VII., 6. Now **יַחַד** being a form precisely analogous to **יִרְבֵּה** and especially to **וַיַּעַר**, Hos. II., 15, it is idle to say that the vowel in the first instance is *furtive*, and in the second a *full* vowel (see, however, Stade, *Grammatik*, p. 85). The possibility is thrown open, then, of retaining a hard sound after a vowel. If so, the same is true of the vowel in the 2d person f. of *Lāmēdh* Guttural verbs. The hard sound of this person might very well be retained, usually, in order to conform to the analogy of the other persons, while a word such as we have considered in this note gives the more accurate form of the same.

IBID.

Note on כָּעַן (Dan. II., 23; Ezra v., 16) **כָּעַנָה** (Ezra IV., 10, 11; VII., 12) **כָּעַת** (Ezra IV., 17).—It may not seem out of place to repeat, substantially, that which has already appeared in print, but which may not have been seen by many readers of *HEBRAICA*. There can be little doubt that these three words have a common origin in **עַת** and **כָּ**, that the root of **עַת** is **עָנָה** (akin to **אָנָה**), that **עַת**, therefore, means “time” as that which is “approaching,” “coming to meet one,” “happening,” and that the word may have a local as well as a temporal signification.¹ According to this, **כָּעַן** may very well mean “now,” as derived from the idea “according to time,” while, in another connection, **כָּעַנָה** or **כָּעַת** may have a local meaning “according to that which immediately follows this place.” No other explanation seems appropriate in Daniel and Ezra, and so the meaning “thus,” “as follows” (not, however, “and so forth,” as given in Gesenius’s *Lexicon*; for “and so forth” refers rather to what is omitted than to what is expressed, while here there is probably no question of anything in mind which might be said in a formula, or the like, but was not) seems the only one admissible.

IBID.

צִלְמוֹת or צִלְמוֹת?—In *The Prophecies of Isaiah* (ed. 3, vol. II., pp. 142–3) I have ventured to combine both views as to the right pronunciation, suggesting “that the original pronunciation was **צִלְמוֹת**, and the original meaning ‘blackness’ or ‘darkness’; but that, as no other offshoot of the same stem had survived in Hebrew, the word passed into disuse, till Amos (v., 8) and Isaiah (IX., 1) revived it.” I suppose these prophets to have needed a fresh word to express “deep gloom,” and to have assumed a didactic derivation from **צֶלַל** and **מוֹת**. I will not repeat my arguments, but quote some remarks of Prof. Nöldeke, who supports Hitzig in his opposition to the now popular theory that **צִלְמוֹת**, i. e., darkness, is the true form. “We have no right, for the sake of a root unproved elsewhere, to give up the ancient traditional and very appropriate pronunciation. Observe, too, that the word occurs seventeen times in the Old Testament, but never in the construct state; this is much more easily explicable if the word is a compound than if it is simple. The only passage (Job XII., 22) in which the gender and number of the word can be recognized, speaks (though not with absolute deci-

¹ See the opinion of Fleischer in appendix to Levy’s *Woerterbuch ueber die Targumim*, p. 572.